

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the present application. A minor oversight in both claims 1 and 6 has been detected and is proposed to be corrected by the above. No additional undue consideration would be required of the Examiner to allow entry of this amendment, which merely corrects informalities in grammar. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry thereof, which is deemed proper.

The Final Office Action of May 31, 2007 includes a rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the Volk patent (U.S. Patent No. 3,623,800) in view of the admitted prior art disclosed at paragraphs 8, 9 and 38 of the present application, as well as the Reshef et al patent (U.S. Patent No. 5,094,520).<sup>1</sup> This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office has made a number of factual assertions about the Volk patent. Applicants respectfully note that if Figure 6 is to scale as asserted by the Office, the radius of curvature of the lens would be approximately 106 mm, using a simple ruler to measure the radius to the front surface by connecting the two chain link lines. In any event, it is obviously far greater than 35 mm and therefore does not meet the recitation of molding a lens blank having a radius of curvature along a principle meridian of less than 35 mm over a substantial portion of the front surface thereof, as recited in claim 1, with similar recitations appearing in claim 6. Also, by simple measurement, it looks as though the hollow depth of the lens is less than 6 mm, and therefore the Volk patent does not meet the recitation of edging a lens blank to provide an edged lens having a hollow depth of at least 8 mm. The Office is relatively dismissive of these recitations by pointing to prior art steeply curved lenses

---

<sup>1</sup> The claim rejection mentions only claims 1-6 in the introductory sentence, but specifically deals with claim 7 as well. It is assumed that the Office intended to reject claims 1-7.

as described in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the present application and the Reshef et al patent, which discloses goggle lenses. Differences between conventional lenses is illustrated in the Volk patent and steeply curved lenses can be seen in Figures 10A-10D. Steeply curved lenses present unique problems as well as advantages, such as the lenses not previously gaining acceptance and difficulties in the fabrication, along with a preference for the Ostwalt section eyewear as opposed to the Wollaston section type steeply curved eyewear. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that one cannot be so dismissive of these recitations in a proper rejection. Forming a steeply curved lens is not the equivalent of a relatively flat lens for reasons of record and therefore it is not simply a matter of finding "the exact curvature" being within the skill level of the art "dependent on exact optical properties desired for the lens" as suggested in the Office Action. Instead, relatively flat Ostwalt-type lenses are fundamentally different in both construction and manner of operation than a steeply curved lens.

One further salient distinction not identified in the Office Action is that the present claims call for "cutting a back surface on the molded lens blank, which, together with the front surface, provides the non-zero prescription through power," as recited in claim 1 or, "a molded back surface on the molded lens blank, which, together with the front surface, provides essentially no through power" as recited in claim 6. As clearly seen in the Volk patent, the lens blank is mounted on a work holder as shown in Figure 2 and then the front surface is apparently molded through operation of the device shown in Figure 4. Hence, the recitation in claim 1 is not met. Further, there is no indication that Volk would provide essentially no through power by molding the back surface of the molded lens blank but particularly since

the present claims call for a radius of curvature along the principle meridian being less than 35 nm, and the lens blanks being edged to provide a pair of edge lenses having a hollow depth of at least 8 mm. If one simply creates a greater curvature in the Volk patent, optical properties of the lens at the edges would be significantly distorted, absent Applicants' own teachings.

In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application. Whether viewed alone or in combination with the secondary teachings, the prior art, taken in its totality, would not teach or suggest the combination of features found in independent claims 1 and 6 and therefore not the dependent claims. The argument presented in the prior Amendment are incorporated by reference with respect to claim 20.

In light of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the above-captioned application. Should any residual issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC



Charles F. Wieland III  
Registration No. 33096

Date: June 21, 2007 :

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404  
703 836 6620